

TRIPS and Access to Medicines

Pharmaceutical Patents and the Experience of Brazil

Renata Curzel



Wolters Kluwer

Published by:

Kluwer Law International B.V.

PO Box 316

2400 AH Alphen aan den Rijn

The Netherlands

E-mail: international-sales@wolterskluwer.com

Website: rus.wolterskluwer.com

Sold and distributed by:

Wolters Kluwer Legal & Regulatory U.S.

7201 McKinney Circle

Frederick, MD 21704

United States of America

Email: customer.service@wolterskluwer.com

Printed on acid-free paper.

ISBN 978-94-035-2882-3

e-Book: ISBN 978-94-035-2874-8

web-PDF: ISBN 978-94-035-2880-9

© 2021 Renata Curzel

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without written permission from the publisher.

Permission to use this content must be obtained from the copyright owner. More information can be found at: rus.wolterskluwer.com/policies/permissions-reprints-and-licensing

Printed and bound by CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations	xvii
List of Tables	xxiii
Acknowledgments	xxv
CHAPTER 1	
Introduction	1
CHAPTER 2	
The Case of Patents and Drugs	7
A Patent Protection and Drug Development	7
I Why Patent Protection?	7
1 Background Information	7
1.1 Introduction	7
1.2 Short History of Patent Protection	9
1.3 Rationales of Patent Protection	12
1.3.1 Noneconomic Justifications for the Patent System	13
1.3.1.1 The “Natural-Law” or “Property” Thesis	13
1.3.1.2 The “Reward-by-Monopoly” Thesis	14
1.3.2 Economic Justifications for the Patent System	15
1.3.2.1 The “Exchange for Secret” Thesis	16
1.3.2.2 The “Incentive to Invent/Innovate” Thesis	16
1.3.3 Do Patents Really Promote Innovation?	17
2 Economic Consequences of the Patent Monopoly	19
2.1 The So-Called Paradox of Patents	19
2.2 Benefits of Patent Protection	20
2.3 Social Costs of Patent Protection	20
2.4 Some Distortions of the Patent System	21
2.4.1 “Leveraging Monopoly Power”	21

Table of Contents

	2.4.2 “Strategic Patenting”	22
	2.4.3 “Patent Thickets”	22
	2.4.4 Disparity Between Contribution and Return	23
	2.4.4.1 The Contribution of Having Been the First	23
	2.4.4.2 “Enclosing the Commons”	23
	2.5 Benefits and Costs for Developing Countries	24
3	The Special Case of Pharmaceutical Patents	26
	3.1 Legal Treatment of Pharmaceutical Patents in Some Industrialized Nations	28
	3.1.1 The United States	29
	3.1.2 Western European Countries	30
	3.2 Legal Treatment of Pharmaceutical Patents in Developing Countries	30
	3.3 Importance of Patent Protection for Pharmaceutical Products	31
4	Justifying Patents Today	32
II	Protecting and Promoting Public Health	33
1	Drugs and Public Health	33
2	Protecting Public Health by Regulating the Efficacy and Safety of Drugs	34
	2.1 Short History of the Pharmacovigilance System	34
	2.2 Principles	35
	2.3 Drug Development Process	36
3	Promoting Public Health by Expanding Access to Medicines	37
4	Relationship Between Patent Protection and Public Health	37
III	How Distortions of the Patent System May Affect Public Health and Access to Medicines	38
1	Setting the Problem in Context	38
2	Some Concepts	38
	2.1 Evergreening of Patents (Secondary or Follow-On Patents)	38
	2.2 “Patent Thickets” or “Patent Clusters”	41
	2.3 “Trivial Patents”	41
3	Practices That Indicate “Evergreening” in the Pharmaceutical Field	42
	3.1 Obtaining Multiple Patenting Regarding the Same Product	43
	3.1.1 Swiss-Type Patent Claims	43
	3.1.1.1 Option One and Two: Product Claims over the Drug/ and or Active Chemicals	44
	3.1.1.2 Option Three: Use Claim over the Use of the Drug (“Use of Known Substance X for New Purpose Y”)	44
	3.1.1.3 Option Four: Use Claim over the Use of the Active Chemicals (Swiss-Type Claim)	44
	3.1.2 Selection Patents or Selection Inventions	45

Table of Contents

	3.1.3 Pharmacologically Active Metabolites	46
	3.1.4 Isomeric Forms	46
	3.1.5 Polymorphs (Crystalline Forms)	47
	3.1.6 Process Patents	47
	3.1.7 Novel Therapeutic Indications in Connection with “Patent Linkage”	48
	3.1.8 Novel Dosage Regimes	48
	3.1.9 Combination Therapies	49
	3.2 Abuse of the Right to Litigation	49
4	Consequences of the Abuse of Patent Rights	49
IV	Ways of Correcting Abuses and Controlling Quality of Patents	50
1	Introduction	50
2	Instruments Within Patent Law	51
	2.1 Instruments Concerning Quality of Patents	51
	2.1.1 Patent Examination System	51
	2.1.2 Patent Opposition System	52
	2.2 Instruments Concerning Public or National Interest	53
	2.2.1 Compulsory Licensing	53
	2.2.2 Voluntary Licensing	56
	2.2.3 Forfeiture of Patents	56
3	New Developments: Searching for Instruments Outside Patent Law in Order to Deal with Patent Law Problems	57
	3.1 Compulsory Licenses of Patents Issued on the Basis of a Violation of Competition Law	58
	3.2 Identifying Misuse of Patent Rights and Other Strategies: The EU Pharma Sector Inquiry	59
	3.3 A Peculiar Legal Instrument: ANVISA’s Prior Consent (Anuência Prévia)	59
4	Conclusion	59
B	International Law, Public Health and Patents	61
I	International Law: The Discourse on Health as a Human Right and the TRIPS Agreement	61
II	International Patent Law and Minimum Standards of Patent Protection Imposed by the TRIPS Agreement	63
	1 Introductory Remarks	63
	2 International Patent Law Before 1996	64
	2.1 Right to National Treatment (Articles 2-3 PC)	65
	2.2 Right of Priority (Article 4 PC)	65
	2.3 Independence of Patents (Article 4bis PC)	65
3	International Patent Law and the International Trade System Before the WTO’s Foundation	65
	3.1 International Trade Law System (1947-1994)	66
	3.1.1 Principles of GATT 1947	66
	3.1.2 General Exceptions to the Non-discrimination Rule (Article XX GATT)	66

Table of Contents

3.1.3	Treaties Other Than the GATT	67
3.2	The GATT Uruguay Round (1986-1994)	67
3.2.1	Introducing Intellectual Property Rights onto the GATT Agenda	67
3.2.2	TRIPS Negotiations	68
3.2.2.1	Controversy Concerning Transitional Periods	68
3.2.2.2	The Special Case of the “Mailbox” Provision (Article 70.8 TRIPS) and Its Respective “Exclusive Marketing Rights” (Article 70.9 TRIPS) as a Compromise Solution for the Rejected “Pipeline” Protection	69
3.2.3	The Results: The “Grand Bargain”	71
4	Objectives and Principles of the TRIPS Agreement	72
4.1	Preamble	72
4.2	Promotion of Technological Innovation Versus Transfer and Dissemination of Technology (Article 7 TRIPS)	72
4.3	Principles Invoked to Protect Public Health and Nutrition and to Deal with the Abuse of Intellectual Property Rights	73
5	Overview of the Provisions on Patents in the TRIPS Agreement	74
5.1	Availability of Patents for Any Inventions, Whether Products or Processes, in All Fields of Technology	74
5.2	Conditions of Patentability	75
5.3	Nondiscrimination (Article 27.1 TRIPS)	76
5.3.1	Discrimination as to the Place of the Invention	76
5.3.2	Discrimination as to the Field of Technology	76
5.3.3	Discrimination as to Whether Products Are Imported or Locally Produced	77
5.3.4	Exceptions to the Principle of Nondiscrimination	77
5.3.4.1	Transitional Periods (Article 65.4 TRIPS)	77
5.3.4.2	Mailbox (Article 70.8 TRIPS)	77
5.3.4.3	Other Exceptions	78
5.3.5	Significance of Article 27.1	78
5.4	Patent Rights Conferred by TRIPS (Article 28)	78
5.5	Conditions on Patent Applicants (Article 29)	79
5.6	Revocation/Forfeiture (Article 32)	79
5.7	Minimum 20 Years’ Protection (Article 33)	79
5.8	Process Patents (Article 34)	80
III	Flexibilities of Patent Rights under the TRIPS Agreement	80
1	Introductory Remarks	80
2	Flexibilities	82
2.1	Parallel Imports	82
2.2	Exclusion from Patentability (Article 27.2 and 27.3 TRIPS)	84

Table of Contents

2.2.1	Conditional Exclusion of Patentability on the Grounds of <i>Ordre Public</i> , Morality or Protection of Public Health	84
2.2.2	Cases of Unconditional Exclusion of Patentability (Article 27.3 TRIPS)	85
2.2.2.1	Methods of Medical Treatment (Article 27.3.a TRIPS)	85
2.2.2.2	Biotechnological Clause (Article 27.3.b TRIPS)	86
2.2.3	Implicit Cases of Exclusion of Patentability	87
2.3	General Exceptions to Rights Conferred by Patents	88
2.4	Compulsory License (Article 31 TRIPS)	90
2.5	The Doha Declaration	92
2.5.1	Negotiating History	92
2.5.2	The Substantive Provisions of the Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health (Doha Declaration)	94
2.5.3	Legal Status and Effects of the Doha Declaration	95
2.6	Special Compulsory License System (Article 31bis TRIPS)	97
2.7	Right to Delay Implementation (Article 65 TRIPS)	98
IV	Post-TRIPS Demands, TRIPS-Plus Provisions and the Developing Countries' Right to Use Flexibilities	99
C	The Brazilian Health Innovation System	100
I	National Systems of Innovation	100
II	Brazilian National Health System of Innovation	101
1	Country Overview	101
2	The Pharmaceutical Industry in Brazil	102
2.1	Historical Development	102
2.2	Market Overview	105
2.3	Research and Development	106
3	Pharmaceutical Production Policies	107
4	The Role of the Brazilian Universities	108
5	The Main Characteristics of the Brazilian Health Innovation System	109
D	ANVISA'S Prior Consent and the WTO	109
I	Relevant Interpretative Rules Contained in the TRIPS Agreement	110
1	Preamble	110
2	Nature and Scope of Obligations (Article 1 TRIPS)	111
3	Objectives (Article 7 TRIPS)	112
4	Principles (Article 8 TRIPS)	112
5	The Doha Declaration	113
II	Relevant Interpretative Rules Outside the TRIPS Agreement	115
1	The WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding	115
2	The Vienna Convention on the Law of the Treaties	115
2.1	General Rule of Interpretation (Article 31 VCLT)	116

Table of Contents

2.1.1	Good Faith	116
2.1.2	Ordinary Meaning	116
2.1.3	Context, Object and Purpose	116
2.2	Supplementary Means of Interpretation (Article 32 VCLT)	117
III	The Meaning of Article 27.1 TRIPS and the Question of the Compatibility of Article 229-C Brazilian Patent Law With It	117
1	Meaning of Article 27.1 TRIPS, First Sentence	118
2	Meaning of Discrimination in Article 27.1 TRIPS, Second Sentence	120
3	Conclusion: Compatibility of Article 229-C LPI with Article 27.1 TRIPS	125
CHAPTER 3		
	The Case of Patents and Drugs in Brazil	129
A	Why Was It Necessary to Create Prior Consent in Brazil?	129
I	Development of Brazilian Patent Law	129
1	National Patent Law Before TRIPS	129
1.1	Historical Development	129
1.2	Legal Treatment of Pharmaceutical Patents	131
2	Negotiating History of the New Patent Act (1990-1996)	134
2.1	Câmara dos Deputados (1991-1993)	134
2.2	SF (1993-1996)	135
3	National Patent Law Post-TRIPS	138
3.1	The Problem of the (In) Direct Applicability (Self-Executing) of TRIPS in Brazil	138
3.2	The New Industrial Property Law (LPI 96)	141
3.2.1	What Is an "Invention" According to the New Legal Framework?	141
3.2.1.1	General Rule	141
3.2.1.2	General Exclusions from the Concept of Invention	142
3.2.2	General Exceptions to Patentability (Article 18 LPI)	151
3.2.2.1	Inventions Against Morality, Good Morals, Security, Ordre Public and Public Health	151
3.2.2.2	Inventions Resulting from the Transformation of the Atomic Nucleus	152
3.2.2.3	Living Beings	153
3.2.3	Provisions Particularly Relevant for Pharmaceutical Inventions	153
3.2.3.1	Transitional Patent Protection for Pharmaceuticals, Chemical and Alimentary Products and Processes	153
3.2.3.2	Compulsory Licensing (Articles 68-71 LPI)	156

Table of Contents

	3.2.3.3	Exceptions to Rights Conferred by a Patent	162
	3.2.3.4	Minimum 10-Years' Term of Patent Protection after Patent Grant	166
	3.3	Important Topics That the LPI 96 Does Not Deal With	167
II		Patent Grant Proceedings	167
	1	Basic Principles of Administrative Law in Brazil	167
	2	Brazilian Judicial System	168
	3	Ordinary Patent Proceedings	168
	3.1	First Administrative Instance	168
	3.2	Second Administrative Instance	170
	3.3	No Provision for Opposition Proceedings	170
III		The LPI 96: A "TRIPS-Plus" Patent Law	170
IV		The Brazilian Policy on Access to Medicines	173
	1	Public Health System (SUS)	173
	2	The Constitutional Right to Health and the Court's Understanding of the Right to Access Medicine	174
	3	AIDS in Brazil	178
	3.1	History and Development of AIDS/HIV in Brazil	178
	3.2	Brazilian National AIDS/HIV Program	178
	4	National Medicines Policy	182
	4.1	Reforming the Public Health Surveillance System: The Creation of the National Health Surveillance Agency (ANVISA)	182
	4.2	Expanding Access to Medicines	183
	4.2.1	Adoption of a List of "Essential" and "Strategic" Medicines	183
	4.2.2	Generic Medicines	184
	5	Controlling Prices	185
	6	Using Compulsory Licensing on the Grounds of Public Health	185
	6.1	Field of Coverage of Decree 3.201	186
	6.2	Cases of National Emergency and Public Interest	186
	6.3	Competent Authority	187
	6.4	Proceedings	187
	6.5	Requirements of the Compulsory License Grants Act	188
	6.6	Threats to Grant Compulsory Licenses as Part of the Medicines Policy (1999-2007)	188
	6.7	The Efavirenz Case: The First and So Far, Only Brazilian Compulsory License on the Grounds of Public Health	190
V		Reasons for Creating ANVISA's Prior Consent	192
	1	Clash Between the New Patent Policy and the National Medicines Policy	192
	2	Discontentment with the INPI's Performance	195
VI		Conclusion	196
B		Contents of the Amendment to the Patent Law (Law 10.196/2001)	198

Table of Contents

I	Legislative History	198
II	Content of the Reform	199
1	Limiting the Possibility of the LPI's Retroactivity (Article 229 LPI)	199
2	Introduction of Article 229 Parágrafo Único LPI (Mailbox Provision—Article 70.8 TRIPS)	201
3	Introduction of Article 229-A LPI	202
4	Introduction of Article 229-B LPI	202
5	<i>Creating ANVISA's Anuência Prévia (Article 229-C LPI) and Its Purpose</i>	203
6	Giving the INPI More Structure (Article 2 MP)	205
7	Introducing the Regulatory Exception ("Early Working")	206
III	Repercussions	206
IV	Conclusion	208
C	The Implementation of ANVISA's Prior Consent Procedure	209
I	Historical Development	209
1	The First Period (2001-2003): Confusing Times	209
2	The Second Period (2003-2012): Rivalry's Times Between ANVISA and the INPI	210
II	The GTI's Suggestions to Solve the Conflict Between the INPI and ANVISA	216
III	Reaction of ANVISA	218
IV	Controversy on the Applicability of Article 229-C in the Brazilian Jurisprudence	220
1	Report of Judgments	220
1.1	Valganciclovir (Valcyte) Case	220
1.2	Docetaxel Case	222
1.3	Penciclovir Case	224
1.4	Leishmaniasis Case	226
1.5	Isobutylgaba Case	227
1.6	Gleevec Case	228
1.7	Gilead Case	229
2	Evaluation	230
D	ANVISA's Examination: What Does It Check and According to Which Criteria?	230
I	The Empirical Study	230
1	Method and Content	230
2	Cases Decided under the Old Workflow	231
2.1	Criteria Used by ANVISA	232
2.1.1	Correction of Translation and Formal Mistakes	232
2.1.2	State of the Art, Lack of Novelty	233
2.1.3	Therapeutic and Surgical Methods	234
2.1.4	State of the Art, Lack of Inventive Step	234
2.1.5	Lack of Sufficient Description of the Invention/Scope of the Invention Too Broad	235

Table of Contents

2.1.6	Selection Inventions (Lack of Inventive Step and Novelty)	237
2.1.7	Second Medical Indication	239
2.1.8	Living Beings	240
2.1.9	Former Patent Law	240
2.1.10	Formal Procedural Criteria of the Patent Law	241
2.1.11	Prior Consent Given after Hearing the Applicant	241
2.2	Standard of ANVISA's Technical Reports	242
2.3	Interpreting the Findings	243
3	Cases Decided under the GTI's Workflow	243
3.1	Criteria Used by ANVISA to Deny Prior Consent	244
3.1.1	"Risk to Health"	244
3.1.2	Invention Considered to Be of Interest to Medicines Policies	245
3.1.2.1	Lack of Novelty	245
3.1.2.2	Lack of an Inventive Step	246
3.1.2.3	Therapeutic Method	247
3.1.2.4	Living Beings	248
3.1.2.5	Insufficient or Imprecise Description	249
3.1.2.6	Claim Too Broad	249
3.1.2.7	Presentation of Information	250
3.2	Standard of ANVISA's Examination under the GTI's Workflow	250
3.3	Interpreting the Findings	253
II	How Often Has ANVISA Denied Prior Consent?	254
1	From 2001 to 2010	254
2	From June 2012 to July 2016	255
III	How Effectively Has ANVISA Influenced the Granting of Patents for Medicines and Has Improved Access to Medicines?	256
1	Period under the Old Workflow (1999-2012)	256
2	Period under the GTI's Workflow (June 2012-July 2016)	257
3	Concluding Remarks	258
IV	Managing the Dispute Between ANVISA and the INPI	259
1	Why Was There a Lack of Cooperation Between ANVISA and the INPI for Such a Long Period?	259
2	The 2017 Solution: ANVISA's Veto Power Comes to an End	261

CHAPTER 4

Integrating Pharmacological Superior Expertise in the Patent Examination for Public Health Policies Interests		263
A	Critique of the 2017 Solution	263
B	How Article 229-C LPI Has Been Interpreted	264
I	Patent Community's View: ANVISA as Controller of the Granting of Pipeline Patents	265

Table of Contents

II	ANVISA's Interpretation of Article 229-C LPI: Acting as an Ordinary Patent Division	265
III	ANVISA as an Instance of "Public Health" Within the Meaning of Article 18, I LPI (2017 Solution)	267
C	The Author's Viewpoint	269
I	Examination of the Patentability's Requirements as the Chore of ANVISA's Prior Consent	269
II	What Does Differ ANVISA's Report from the INPI's and What Is the Use of It?	270
1	Finding the Right Balance Between Innovation Policy and Health Policy	270
2	Pharmacological Expert Knowledge	271
3	INPI Versus ANVISA: A Conflict Within the Patent Community?	272
3.1	The Conception of "Epistemic Community" and "Legal Epistemic Community"	272
3.2	The Conflict INPI Versus ANVISA as a Conflict Between Two Different Patent Communities	274
3.3	Consequences	274
4	The Regulatory Function of Patents	275
III	Conclusion: ANVISA's Prior Consent as a "Raising the Bar" Reform to the Patentability of Pharmaceutical Inventions in Benefit of Access Rights	276
CHAPTER 5		
	Lessons for the Future	279
	Bibliography	283
	Table of Cases	331
	Personal Interviews	335
	List of Cited ANVISA's Reports on Prior Consent Within Patent Proceedings at the INPI	337
	Index	341